



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,910	07/20/2004	Young-Nam Hwang	3254-0121PUS1	8720

2292 7590 10/10/2008
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

PIZIALI, ANDREW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1794

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

10/10/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10501910	7/20/04	HWANG ET AL.	3254-0121PUS1

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

Andrew T. Piziali

ART UNIT	PAPER
1794	20081003

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The applicant filed a knowingly unsigned declaration on 10/23/2007 and then a signed copy on 11/20/2007. In the interview summary mailed 2/26/2008 the examiner indicated that the declaration would not be entered at that time. In an attempt to circumvent the examiner, applicant's representative contacted SPE Terrel Morris and requested the declaration be entered. In the interview summary mailed 3/12/2008, SPE Terrel Morris indicated that the examiner's actions were proper. Nevertheless, in the interest of customer service, SPE Terrel Morris instructed the examiner to consider the declaration because applicant's representative indicated that the declaration was necessary to proceed to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. In the Advisory Action mailed 4/11/2008 the examiner entered and considered the declaration, but found the arguments unpersuasive. On 7/21/2008 the applicant filed an RCE, choosing not to proceed to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, along with a second knowingly unsigned declaration. On 8/8/2008 a supplemental reply was filed by the applicant containing a signed copy of the second declaration.

The supplemental reply filed 8/8/2008, including a signed copy of the second declaration, has not been entered or considered. A reply that is supplemental to a reply that is in compliance with § 1.111(b) will not be entered as a matter of right except as provided in paragraph (a)(2)(ii) of 37 CFR 1.111.

/Andrew T Piziali/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794